REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-19, 21-30, and 32-38 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 12, 20, and 31 have been previously cancelled. Claims 39-74 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the application in view of the present amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-19, 21-30, and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Radha (U.S. Patent No. 6,639,943 B1) in view of Tan (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,549 B1). In order to expedite allowance, the rejected claims are being cancelled herein, without disclaimer and without prejudice. According, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are now moot.

Claims 39-74 have been added to clarify certain features of the subject matter being claimed. The limitations in these new claims are not disclosed or suggested in either Radha or Tan (whether alone or in combination).

Radha is directed to video coding issues, such as generating different frame types (layers or streams) and sharing structural elements within a decoder to reduce complexity. (See Col. 4, lines 42-52; Col. 7, lines 36-45; and Col. 11, lines 9-23). Tan is related to a Video Complexity Verifier (VCV) and a Video Buffering Verifier (VBV) that use time stamps for one bitstream. See FIGs. 6 and 20. There is no teaching or suggesting in two references on how the one stream time stamps in Tan can be used with the different frame types (or streams) of Radha and/or how to time stamp the different plans (or data)

-14-

within the frame types of Radha. In addition, the two references do not disclose or suggest a system/method that is intended to solve a system timing issue to conserve, for example, frame buffers (e.g., by setting up certain time-stamping rules and/or restrictions) as in the present invention.

The support for the new claims can be found the disclosure on at least page 14, line 11 through page 15, line 7; page 15, lines 15-17; page 16, line 16 through page 17, line 4; FIGs. 1, 2, 3, and 5; and original Claims 1-38.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 39-74 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By

Peter C. Hsueh
Reg. No. 45,574
626/795-9900

PCH/dlf
DLF PAS635064.1-*-08/15/05 2:29 PM

-15-